



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION**

JOHN HENRY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

D. RIVERA, D. CRAGG,  
T. FREEZE, and K. RAGLAND,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:24-6043-MGL-TER

---

---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND DISMISSING THE COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE  
AGAINST CERTAIN DEFENDANTS,  
WITHOUT FURTHER LEAVE TO AMEND,  
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

---

---

Plaintiff John Henry (Henry) filed this lawsuit against Defendants D. Rivera (Rivera), D.

Cragg (Cragg), T. Freeze (Freeze), and K. Ragland (Ragland). Henry is representing himself.

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court Rivera, Freeze, and Ragland be dismissed with prejudice, without further leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on October 30, 2024, but Henry failed to file any objections, even after the Court granted him an extension of time to do so. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report, and incorporates it herein. It is therefore the judgment of the Court Rivera, Freeze, and Ragland are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**, without further leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process. As such, the case will go forward only against Cragg.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 7th day of May, 2025, in Columbia, South Carolina.

/s/ Mary Geiger Lewis

MARY GEIGER LEWIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Henry is hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.